



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/558,974 | 04/27/2000 | Ari Vaisanen | NC26081-NC26105 | 1855 |
| 30973 | 7590 | 09/22/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P. 5956 SHERRY LANE SUITE 1400 DALLAS, TX 75225 | | | PHILPOTT, JUSTIN M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2665 | |

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/558,974

Applicant(s)

VAISANEN ET AL.

Examiner

Justin M Philpott

Art Unit

2665

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 2-20

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☒ The drawing correction filed on 09 August 2004 is a) ☒ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Specifically, applicant argues (pages 11-12) that Su does not teach a variable attenuator. However, as admitted by applicant, Su clearly teaches an attenuator in the form of PI. Further, as discussed in the previously cited passages of Su, the attenuation is inherently "variable" as evident by the statement, "each path may comprise more than one unknown attenuation" (col. 5, line 27-28), wherein "PI" is used by Su to indicate the "unknown attenuation" (e.g., see FIG. 3). Thus, Su provides that the total "PI unknown attenuation" is inherently variable by teaching that more than one unknown attenuation may be included. Accordingly, applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Further, applicant argues that Su does not teach controlling the attenuation using a test controller. However, as discussed in the previous office action, and repeated herein, Su clearly teaches the entire process of calibrating gain and path loss is performed by processing logic (col. 5, lines 29-32). Further, Su teaches the entire process of power level calibration is performed by the processing logic (col. 6, lines 45-49). Still further, Su specifically recites that the "processing logic calibrates the step attenuators for the transceivers" (col. 7, lines 36-39). Thus, Su clearly teaches controlling the attenuation using the processing logic, or the "test controller" recited by applicant. Accordingly, applicant's argument is not persuasive.